

**Remarks**

The Examiner has indicated, in paragraph 11 of the Office Action, that claims 5-9 have allowable subject matter. These claims have been rejected due to lack of support for the word "vending". In the prior office action, the Examiner suggested substituting for "vending" the word "allocating". Claim 5 is being so amended. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 5-9 are now allowable.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of the other independent claims, claims 1, 10 and 21, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the interpretation of "any one of a plurality" in claim 1, "any one of at least two" in claim 10, and "any one of a plurality" in claim 21 as still reading on just one, as stated in paragraph 10 of the Office Action as the reason for deeming Applicant's arguments as not persuasive. This is not the interpretation that Applicant intended. Applicant thanks the Examiner for explaining the claim interpretation issue.

Applicant has amended the claim language to delete the "any one of" term so that the claims unambiguously state "a plurality" or "at least two". It is believed that this correction will result in the claims being patentable for the reasons stated in the previous response and considered by the Examiner. The argument from the previous response is set forth in Appendix A, for the convenience of the Examiner, with reference to the clarified language of amended claims 1, 10 and 21.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to resolve any outstanding issues and expedite the allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

BY /Joseph R. Jordan/  
Joseph R. Jordan, Reg. No. 25,686

2700 Carew Tower  
Cincinnati, OH 45202  
(513) 241-2324  
(513) 241-6234 (Facsimile)  
jjordan@whepatent.com (Email)

## APPENDIX A

### **Argument from Previous Response adapted to clarified language of amended claims.**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4 and 21 as being unpatentable over MacTaggart U.S. Patent No. 5,236,086 in view of Torii U.S. Patent No. 5,598,151. Applicant submits that neither MacTaggart nor Torri, considered alone or in combination, suggests a case for securing articles comprising structure configured to receive and support a wireless transmitter of a plurality of different facility security systems, to connect the sensor to a wireless transmitter supported by the receiving structure, and to communicate the alarm condition from the sensor to the transmitter in response to a breach of security of the interior space, as recited by claim 1. Further, neither reference teaches a case for securing articles for protection by a security system where the case comprises wireless or other means on the enclosure for connecting the sensor to a plurality of different facility security systems, as recited by claim 21.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5-8, 10-14 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MacTaggart in view of Torii and in further view of Yagesh U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0113783. Yagesh also does not teach a case useful with any one of a plurality of different facility security systems.

Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of the obviousness of Applicant's claimed combination is made by the cited references.

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the feature of the case of the invention as claimed wherein a single article security case can be used with any of more than one different facility or premises security system. This provides advantages not provided by the prior art.

For example, many facilities such as residential premises are protected by alarm systems that protect the premises against theft. It is possible to have these systems installed with special enclosures in which to secure jewelry, firearms or other items with the enclosures wired with sensors that are coupled to the facility alarm system, so that tampering with the enclosure will trip the facility alarm. Many facility alarm system

vendors provide add-ons to expand the system to provide special article enclosures. But to connect these to the facility alarm system, vendor specific sensors or transmitters or wiring must be added to the system, which involves considerable expense. Further, not every alarm system manufacturer makes available every kind of specialty enclosure that a customer might want.

The present invention provides enclosures in the form of cases in which to secure any of a number of kinds of items. These cases can be sold by sellers of the items that are to be protected. For example, a gun dealer can stock and sell a gun case provided by the present invention as an accessory to a firearm being sold to a customer. The customer can connect the case into a home alarm system without regard to the brand or type of system that the customer has. That is because a case according to the present invention has provision for accepting a wireless transmitter or some other means that might be provided by or available from the maker of any one of many facility or premises alarm systems to work with that system. This provides a potentially low cost alternative to the cost of upgrading a facility alarm system by the system manufacturer.

In independent claim 1, for example, an alarm ready case that includes a base, an openable lid, an interior space, a lock, and at least one sensor is provided with receiving structure configured to receive and support a wireless transmitter of a plurality of different facility security systems and circuitry configured to connect the sensor to such a wireless transmitter to communicate an alarm condition.

Independent claim 10 calls for a case for securing articles for protection by any of a plurality of security systems. The case includes an openable enclosure having an interior space, a lock, a sensor and connectivity structure configured to connect the sensor to at least two different means compatible with at least one of the plurality of security systems.

Further, in independent claim 21, a case comprises an openable enclosure having an interior space, a lock, a sensor, and means for connecting the sensor to a plurality of different facility security systems.

It can be seen that the cited references, considered alone or together, lack a distinguishing feature of the combination claimed by Applicant.